In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS No. 19-1946V UNPUBLISHED

GLENDA KELLETT,

Petitioner.

٧.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: November 18, 2020

Special Processing Unit (SPU); Ruling on Entitlement; Concession; Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine; Guillain-Barre Syndrome (GBS)

Maximillian J. Muller, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for petitioner.

Lara Ann Englund, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On December 23, 2019, Glenda Kellett filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleges that she suffered Guillain-Barré Syndrome (GBS) caused-in-fact by the influenza vaccine she received on December 31, 2016. Petition at ¶¶ 2, 32. Petitioner further alleges that she received the vaccination in the United States, that she suffered the residual effects of her GBS for more than six months and that neither she nor any other party has filed a civil action or received compensation for her GBS, alleged as vaccine caused. *Id.* at ¶¶ 2, 32-34. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all "§" references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On October 8, 2020, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 6, ECF No. 17. Specifically, Respondent believes that "[P]etitioner has satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table ("Table") and the Qualifications and Aids to Interpretation ("QAI")." *Id.* (citing 42 C.F.R. §§ 100.3(a)(XIV)(D), 100.3(c)(15)).

In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran
Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master